

1	G. HOPKINS GUY, III (SBN 124811)				
2	hopguy@orrick.com VICKIE L. FEEMAN (SBN 177487)				
3	vfeeman@orrick.com BAS DE BLANK (SBN 191487)				
4	<u>basdeblank@orrick.com</u> BRIAN H. VANDERZANDEN (SBN 233134)				
5	bvanderzanden@orrick.com ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP				
6	1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025				
7	Telephone: (650) 614-7400 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401				
8	Attorneys for Defendants	SIONAL INC			
9	FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR INTERNATIONAL, INC., FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION AND				
10	SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION				
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
13	(SAN JOSE DIVISION)				
14					
15	POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation,	Case No. C-09-5235 JW (PVT)			
16	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANTS FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR			
17	V.	INTERNATIONAL, INC., FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR			
18	FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR	CORPORATION AND SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION'S			
19	INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware corporation, FAIRCHILD	ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COUNTERCLAIMS ON REPLY			
20	SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation, and SYSTEM	COUNTERCLAIMS ON RELET			
21	GENERAL CORPORATION, a Taiwanese	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
22	corporation,				
23	Defendants.				
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Defendants Fairchild Semiconductor International, Inc., Fairchild Semiconductor Corporation, and System General Corporation (collectively "Defendants") answer the Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims of Plaintiff and Counterclaimant Power Integrations, Inc. ("Power Integrations") as follows:

Defendants deny each and every allegation contained in the Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims of Power Integrations, except as hereinafter specifically admitted or explained. To the extent that the headings, or any other non-numbered statements in Power Integrations' Complaint contain any allegations, Defendants deny each and every allegation therein.

THE PARTIES

- 1. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 81 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.
- 2. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 82 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.
- 3. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 83 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.
- 4. Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 84 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. In response to paragraph 85 of the Power Integrations' Declaratory Counterclaims, Complaint, Defendants admit that the Counterclaims purport to bring an action under the Federal Declaratory Judgments Acts, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 U.S.C. §271 *et seq.*, but Defendants expressly deny any liability thereunder. Defendants also admit that the Counterclaims purport to state a cause of action over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201 and 2202.
- 6. In response to paragraph 86 of the Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims, Defendants do not dispute that this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants.

1	7.	In response to paragraph 87 of the Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment		
2	Counterclaims, for the purpose of this action only, that venue is proper in this judicial district.			
3	GENERAL ALLEGATIONS			
4	8.	Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 88 of Power Integrations'		
5	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.			
6	9.	Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 89 of Power Integrations'		
7	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaim.			
8	10.	Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 90 of Power Integrations'		
9	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaim.			
10	ANSWER TO FIRST COUNTERCLAIM			
11	DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO.			
		5.747,977		
12	11.	Defendants reallege their answers as set forth in paragraphs 1-10 above as though		
13	fully set forth in this paragraph.			
14	12.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 92 of Power Integrations'		
15	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.			
16	13.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 93 of Power Integrations'		
17	Declaratory.	Judgment Counterclaims.		
18		ANSWER TO SECOND COUNTERCLAIM		
19	DECLA	RATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5.747,977		
20	14.	Defendants reallege their answers as set forth in paragraphs 1-10 above as though		
21	fully set forth in this paragraph.			
22	15.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 95 of Power Integrations'		
23	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims. Additionally, the '977 patent shall be presumed valid			
24	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §282.			
25	16.	Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 96 of Power Integrations'		
26	Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims. Additionally, the '977 patent shall be presumed valid			
27	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §282.			
28				

ANSWER TO THIRD COUNTERCLAIM DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,257,008

- 17. Defendants reallege their answers as set forth in paragraphs 1-10 above as though fully set forth in this paragraph.
- 18. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 98 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.
- 19. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 99 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.

ANSWER TO FOURTH COUNTERCLAIM DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,257,008

- 20. Defendants reallege their answers as set forth in paragraphs 1-10 above as though fully set forth in this paragraph.
- 21. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 101 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims. Additionally, the '008 patent shall be presumed valid pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §282.
- 21.1 Defendants admit that Balu Balakrishnan is identified as the inventor on the face of U.S. patent No. 5,285,369, and that the U.S. patent No. 5,285,369 states that it was filed on September 1, 1992. Defendants admit Power Integrations was sued in China for infringing Chinese patent ZL 200510054730.0. Defendants deny all other allegations of Paragraph 101.1.
- 21.2 Defendants the allegations of Paragraph 101.2 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims.
- 22. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 102 of Power Integrations' Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims. Additionally, the '008 patent shall be presumed valid pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §282.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Defendants request the following relief with regard to its Answer and Declaratory Judgment Counterclaims:

1	1.	That the Court enter judgmen	t against Power Integrations and dismisses with			
2	prejudice any and all of its counterclaims, and order that Power Integrations take nothing as a					
3	result of its c	result of its counterclaims;				
4	2.	The Court awards to Defenda	nts their reasonable costs and attorney's fees against			
5	Power Integr	Power Integrations pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §285;				
6	3.	3. The Court grants to Defendants such other and further relief as may be deemed				
7	just and appr	opriate.				
8						
9						
10	D (1 I)	25, 2010	C HONKING CHN/ HI			
11	Dated: June 2	25, 2010	G. HOPKINS GUY, III VICKIE L. FEEMAN			
12			BAS DE BLANK BRIAN H. VANDERZANDEN OPPICK HERRINGTON & SUTCHEEE LLD			
13			ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP			
14			/s/ Brian H. VanderZanden			
15			Brian H. VanderZanden Attorneys for Defendants FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR			
16			INTERNATIONAL, INC., FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION AND			
17			SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION			
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE					
2	I hereby certify that on this date I electronically filed DEFENDANTS FAIRCHILD					
3	I hereby certify that on this date I electronically filed DEFENDANTS FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR INTERNATIONAL, INC., FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION AND SYSTEM GENERAL CORPORATION'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIES'S COUNTEDCLAIMS ON DEED IN with the clock of court for the United States.					
4	PLAINTIFF'S COUNTERCLAIMS ON REPLY with the clerk of court for the United States District Court, Northern District of California, using the electronic case filing system of the court The electronic case filing system sent a "Notice of Electronic Filing" to the attorneys of record					
5	who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic					
6	means.					
7	Detade June 25, 2010	/r/ In ratto Damana				
8	Dated: June 25, 2010	/s/ Josette Romero Josette Romero				
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

OHS West:260931914.1 10414-2002 HT0/BV2 -1-

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE C-09-5235 JW (PVT)